

THU-99/15
hep-th/9906095

Modifications of the area law and $N=2$ supersymmetric black holes

BERNARD DE WIT

*Institute for Theoretical Physics, Utrecht University
3508 TA Utrecht, The Netherlands*

Abstract

Modifications of the area law are crucial in order to find agreement with microscopic entropy calculations based on string theory, when including contributions that are sub-leading for large charges. The deviations of the area law are in accord with Wald's proposal for the entropy based on a Noether charge. We discuss this for the case of four-dimensional $N = 2$ supersymmetric black holes.

It is a pleasure and an honour to speak at this conference and pay tribute to Francois Englert's scientific achievements. This meeting brings back so many memories of previous encounters with him which were both enjoyable and scientifically fruitful. I will speak about some recent work, done in collaboration with Gabriel Lopes

Cardoso and Thomas Mohaupt, on the entropy of $N = 2$ supersymmetric black holes [1]. The first law of black hole mechanics relates a change in the mass and angular momentum of a black hole to the change in the area of its event horizon. This then leads to the Bekenstein-Hawking area law, which expresses the black hole entropy in terms of the horizon area. The first law relates global quantities of a black hole, such as its energy or mass and its angular momentum which can be determined from the behaviour of the fields at spatial infinity, to the horizon area which is defined at the inner boundary of the black hole solution. The similarity with thermodynamics suggests a possible interpretation of the entropy in terms of microstates. Such a connection has recently been provided in the context of string theory [2]. More specifically, for four-dimensional extremal black holes in the limit of large electric/magnetic charges Q , it was found that the entropy is generically of the form

$$\mathcal{S} \sim \sqrt{Q^4}. \quad (1)$$

This result can be compared to macroscopic results based on corresponding effective field theories. These theories are complicated and will depend on many fields and eventually involve higher-derivative interactions. As it turns out, the latter interactions are related to corrections to (1) that are subleading in the charges and of order Q^0 . Such subleading terms have recently been obtained for IIA string theory and M-theory [3] and full agreement with the macroscopic description has been established in [1].

How can the results of the macroscopic description, which is very complicated, yet be so constrained as to precisely reproduce the results from the counting of microstates? Before answering this question let me first characterize the black-hole solutions that I will be discussing. They are four-dimensional, static, rotationally

symmetric solitonic interpolations between two $N = 2$ supersymmetric groundstates: flat Minkowski spacetime at spatial infinity and Bertotti-Robinson spacetime at the horizon. Globally the solution possesses only a residual $N = 1$ supersymmetry, so that one is dealing with a BPS state and thus an extremal black hole. The effective field theory is based on $N = 2$ supergravity coupled to a number of vector multiplets whose gauge fields are associated with electric and magnetic charges, denoted by q_I and p^I , respectively. The theory incorporates, in a systematic fashion, the phenomenon of electric/magnetic duality, according to which the electric and magnetic charges can be interchanged and/or rotated and it includes higher-derivative couplings with among them a certain class of terms quadratic in the Riemann tensor.

The crucial ingredient that is responsible for the remarkable restrictions on the entropy formulae obtained on the basis of these complicated effective field theories, is the enhancement to full supersymmetry at the horizon. However, it turns out that in order to obtain agreement for the first subleading corrections with the counting of microstates provided by string theory, one is forced to depart from the Bekenstein-Hawking area law. Instead one must adopt Wald's proposal for the entropy which ensures the validity of the first law of black hole mechanics for more generic field theories. This proposal is based on the existence of a Noether charge associated with an isometry evaluated at the corresponding Killing horizon [4]. When evaluating this current subject to the field equations, current conservation becomes trivial and the current takes the form of an improvement term, i.e., the divergence of an antisymmetric tensor. This antisymmetric tensor, sometimes called the Noether potential, is a local function of the fields and of the (arbitrary) gauge transformation parameters.

In order to elucidate some of this this let me briefly consider a simple abelian gauge theory, with a gauge-invariant Lagrangian depending on the field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$, its derivatives $\partial_\rho F_{\mu\nu}$, as well as on matter fields ψ and first derivatives thereof. Furthermore we add a so-called topological mass term, so that the total Lagrangian takes the form

$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{total}} = \mathcal{L}^{\text{inv}}(F_{\mu\nu}, \partial_\rho F_{\mu\nu}, \psi, \nabla_\mu \psi) + c \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} A_\mu \partial_\nu A_\rho, \quad (2)$$

where $\nabla_\mu \psi$ is the covariant derivative of ψ and c is some constant. Note that the topological mass term restricts us to three spacetime dimensions, but this is not relevant for what follows. Under gauge transformations

$$\delta_\xi A_\mu(x) = \partial_\mu \xi(x), \quad \delta_\xi \psi(x) = i\xi(x) \psi(x), \quad (3)$$

the Lagrangian is not invariant but changes into a total derivative,

$$\delta_\xi \mathcal{L}^{\text{total}} = \partial_\mu N^\mu(\phi, \xi) = c \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} \partial_\mu \xi \partial_\nu A_\rho, \quad (4)$$

where generically ϕ denotes all the fields and ξ denotes the transformation parameters.

Under arbitrary variations $\phi \rightarrow \phi + \delta\phi$ we have the standard decomposition into a surface term and the field equations,

$$\delta \mathcal{L}^{\text{total}} = \partial_\mu \theta^\mu(\phi, \delta\phi) + \delta\phi \cdot E(\phi). \quad (5)$$

Here $E(\phi)$ denotes the field equations. The conserved Noether current is then defined by

$$J^\mu(\phi, \xi) = \theta^\mu(\phi, \delta_\xi \phi) - N^\mu(\phi, \xi), \quad (6)$$

where we observe that, unlike the first term, the second term is not necessarily proportional to the symmetry variations $\delta_\xi \phi$. For the

above example the explicit expression for the current reads,

$$J^\mu(\phi, \xi) = 2 \mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu \xi - 2 \partial_\rho \mathcal{L}^{(\rho, \mu)\nu} \partial_\nu \xi + 2 \mathcal{L}^{[\rho, \mu]\nu} \partial_\rho \partial_\nu \xi + \mathcal{L}^\mu \xi \psi - 2c \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} \xi \partial_\nu A_\rho + c' \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} \partial_\nu (\xi A_\rho), \quad (7)$$

where $\mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu}$, $\mathcal{L}^{\rho, \mu\nu}$ and $\mathcal{L}^\mu$ denote the derivatives of the action with respect to $F_{\mu\nu}$, $\partial_\rho F_{\mu\nu}$ and $\nabla_\mu \psi$, respectively. Observe that the Bianchi identity implies $\mathcal{L}^{[\rho, \mu]\nu} = 0$. I also included an improvement term parametrized by an arbitrary constant c' , which reflects an ambiguity in defining N^μ . Its significance will become clear shortly, but at this point I note that for $c' = 2c$ the current depends only on the derivative of ξ (which equals $\delta_\xi A_\mu$). On the other hand, the current is only gauge invariant when we choose $c' = 0$.

Because (7) is conserved for any function ξ , one argues that, for fields satisfying the field equations, the current can be written as the divergence of a so-called Noether potential,

$$J^\mu = \partial_\nu \mathcal{Q}^{\mu\nu}. \quad (8)$$

In the example, the Noether potential $\mathcal{Q}^{\mu\nu}$ takes the form

$$\mathcal{Q}^{\mu\nu}(\phi, \xi) = 2 \mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu} \xi - 2 \partial_\rho \mathcal{L}^{\rho, \mu\nu} \xi + \mathcal{L}^{\rho, \mu\nu} \partial_\rho \xi + c' \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} A_\rho \xi, \quad (9)$$

and is thus a local function of the fields and of the transformation parameter ξ . Observe that $\mathcal{Q}_{\mu\nu}$ does not have to vanish for field configurations that are invariant (in the case at hand, this would imply $\partial_\mu \xi = \xi \psi = 0$).

Integration of the Noether potential over the boundary of some (spacelike) hypersurface leads to a surface charge, which, when restricting the gauge transformation parameters to those that leave the background invariant, is equal to the Noether charge in the usual sense. Under certain conditions this surface charge remains

constant under variations that continuously connect solutions of the equations of motion. Here I have in mind a continuous variety of solutions of the field equations which are left invariant under a corresponding variety of residual gauge transformations. Hence, the parameters ξ that characterize the residual symmetry may change continuously with the solution. Denoting the combined change of the solution ϕ and the symmetry parameters ξ by the variation $\hat{\delta}$, one may thus write

$$\hat{\delta}(\delta_\xi \phi) = 0. \quad (10)$$

Now suppose that the Noether current can be written as a function of ϕ and $\delta_\xi \phi$. In that case one knows that $\hat{\delta}J(\phi, \delta_\xi \phi)$ remains proportional to $\delta_\xi \phi$ and must therefore vanish for the symmetric configurations. Consequently $\hat{\delta}\mathcal{Q}^{\mu\nu}(\phi, \xi)$ must vanish up to a closed form, $\partial_\rho \omega^{[\mu\nu\rho]}$, so that the surface charge obtained by integration over a Cauchy surface C with volume element $d\Omega^\mu$,

$$\int_C d\Omega_\mu J^\mu(\phi, \delta_\xi \phi) = \oint_{\partial C} d\Sigma_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{Q}^{\mu\nu}(\phi, \xi), \quad (11)$$

is constant under the variations induced by $\hat{\delta}$. In the example this situation is realized by choosing $c' = 2c$, because in this case the ξ -dependence of the current is fully captured in $\delta_\xi \phi$. Observe, however, that the integrand on the right-hand side is in principle nonvanishing and nonconstant, so that the constancy of the total surface charge represents a nontrivial result.

Let me now return to general relativity and try to apply the same arguments. Here the gauge transformations are represented by the diffeomorphisms and the residual gauge symmetries correspond to certain Killing vectors. The Lagrangian is not invariant but transforms as a density, which implies that $N^\mu(\phi, \xi) \propto \xi^\mu \mathcal{L}$. Under field variations the Lagrangian will vary into the quantity $\theta^\mu(\phi, \delta\phi)$ defined in (5), so that the variations of the Noether charge

will show a certain systematics which will reflect itself in the final result. When the Lagrangian depends arbitrarily on the Riemann tensor $R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ (but not on its derivatives) and on matter fields and their first-order derivatives, one can show that the Noether potential takes the form

$$\mathcal{Q}^{\mu\nu}(\phi, \xi) = -2\mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \nabla_\rho \xi_\sigma + \dots, \quad (12)$$

where the extra terms depend on ξ^μ but not on derivatives thereof and $\mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ is defined by $\partial\mathcal{L}/\partial R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$. Observe that $\mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ is antisymmetric in $[\mu\nu]$ and in $[\rho\sigma]$ and it is symmetric under pair exchange and satisfies the cyclicity property, $\mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = \mathcal{L}^{\rho\sigma\mu\nu} = -2\mathcal{L}^{\rho[\mu\nu]\sigma}$.

As was shown by Wald [4] one can employ the Noether charge in order to find generalized definitions of the black hole entropy that ensure the validity of the first law of black hole mechanics. The crucial observation [4] is that there exists a Hamiltonian, whose change under a variation of the fields (Wald assumes that the vector field ξ^μ associated with the diffeomorphism remains constant) can be expressed in terms of the corresponding change of the Noether charge and takes the following form

$$\delta H = \delta\left(\int_C d\Omega_\mu J^\mu(\phi, \xi)\right) - 2 \int_C d\Omega_\mu \nabla_\nu \left(\xi^{[\mu} \theta^{\nu]}(\phi, \delta\phi)\right). \quad (13)$$

Here the second term is induced by the variation of the N^μ component of the current, which in this case is associated with a particular timelike Killing vector field ξ^μ whose Killing horizon coincides with the black hole event horizon. The quantity H can be associated with a Hamiltonian that governs the evolution along the integral timelike lines of ξ^μ . In order that this Hamiltonian exists, the second term in (13) should be expressible as the variation of some other term. Whenever ξ^μ is a Killing vector of the background solution and $\delta\phi$ connects different solution of the equations of motion, δH

will vanish. On the other hand, when imposing the equations of motion, (13) takes the form of surface integrals over the boundary ∂C with surface element $d\Sigma_{\mu\nu}$,

$$\delta H = \int_{\partial C} d\Sigma_{\mu\nu} \left(\delta \mathcal{Q}^{\mu\nu}(\phi, \xi) - \xi^\mu \theta^\nu(\phi, \delta\phi) + \xi^\nu \theta^\mu(\phi, \delta\phi) \right). \quad (14)$$

Here it is important that the last two terms are proportional to the Killing vector and not to its derivatives. I already mentioned that one assumes that these terms can be rewritten (at least locally) as variations. Then, up to a proportionality factor, the resulting variations of the surface integrals at infinity correspond to the mass and angular momentum variations that one has in the first law, while the surface integral at the horizon defines the variation of the entropy. Hence the mass, the angular momentum and the entropy are surface charges derived from the same current. The entropy takes the form of an integral over the Noether potential

$$\mathcal{S} = -\pi \int_{\Sigma_{\text{hor}}} \mathcal{Q}^{\mu\nu} \epsilon_{\mu\nu} \Big|_{\xi^\mu=0, \nabla_{[\mu} \xi_{\nu]}=\epsilon_{\mu\nu}}. \quad (15)$$

Here Σ_{hor} denotes a spacelike cross section of the Killing horizon (which usually has the topology of S^2) and we have used $d\Sigma_{\mu\nu} = \epsilon_{\mu\nu} \sqrt{h} d^2x$. Furthermore $\epsilon_{\mu\nu}$ denotes the binormal spanned by two lighlike vectors at the horizon, which is normalized according to $\epsilon_{\mu\nu}\epsilon^{\mu\nu} = -2$. To appreciate the two conditions, $\xi^\mu = 0$ and $\nabla_{[\mu} \xi_{\nu]} = \epsilon_{\mu\nu}$, we first note that the Noether potential $\mathcal{Q}^{\mu\nu}$ can generally be decomposed according to $\mathcal{Q}^{\mu\nu} = N^{\mu\nu\rho} \xi_\rho + Y^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \nabla_{[\rho} \xi_{\sigma]}$. This is so, because the derivatives of a Killing vector field are not independent: the first derivative is proportional to the curl owing to the Killing condition whereas higher derivatives are related to lower ones according to the general identity $\nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu \xi_\rho = R_{\nu\rho\mu}{}^\sigma \xi_\sigma$. Obviously the condition on the curl of the Killing vector just sets its normalization and that of the corresponding Noether potential.

In many cases the terms proportional to ξ^μ cannot contribute for symmetry reasons. Both these conditions are subtle for extremal black holes, because the surface gravity vanishes at the horizon. We leave these issues aside here and refer to the literature but we stress that the definition (15) applies to both extremal and nonextremal black holes.

Obviously, the constancy of the surface charge implied by the vanishing of the left-hand side of (14) then ensures the validity of the first law. The normalization in (15) has been chosen such that, with our conventions, we reproduce the Bekenstein-Hawking area law for static black holes in general relativity. In the presence of higher-derivative terms, the entropy of a static black hole solution will in general not any longer be given by the area. When the Lagrangian depends on the Riemann curvature (but not on its derivatives) and on matter fields and their first derivatives, one can make use of (12) so that the entropy of the static black hole equals

$$\mathcal{S} = 2\pi \int_{\Sigma_{\text{hor}}} \mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \epsilon_{\mu\nu} \epsilon_{\rho\sigma} . \quad (16)$$

This is the result I will be using for the supersymmetric black holes.

Let me now turn to the supergravity Lagrangians that give rise to these extremal black holes, which are based on the coupling of n vector multiplets to $N = 2$ supergravity. In general they contain various other couplings, such as those associated with hypermultiplets, which, however, play only a limited role in the following and will be omitted. The construction of the coupling of vector multiplets to $N = 2$ supergravity utilizes the so-called superconformal multiplet calculus which enables one to straightforwardly include the interactions proportional to the square of the Riemann tensor (the appropriate references can be found in [1]). In the superconformal framework, there is a multiplet, the so-called Weyl multi-

plet, which comprises the gravitational degrees of freedom, namely the graviton, two gravitini as well as various other superconformal gauge fields and also some auxiliary fields. One of these auxiliary fields is an anti-selfdual Lorentz tensor field T^{abij} , where $i, j = 1, 2$ denote chiral $SU(2)$ indices. The field strengths corresponding to the various gauge fields in the Weyl multiplet reside in a so-called reduced chiral multiplet, denoted by W^{abij} , from which one then constructs the unreduced chiral multiplet $W^2 = (W^{abij}\varepsilon_{ij})^2$. The lowest component field of W^2 is equal to $\hat{A} = (T^{abij}\varepsilon_{ij})^2$.

In addition, there are $n + 1$ abelian vector multiplets labelled by an index $I = 0, \dots, n$. The extra vector multiplet is required to provide the graviphoton field of supergravity. Each vector multiplet contains a complex scalar field X^I , a vector gauge field W_μ^I with field strength $F_{\mu\nu}^I$, as well as a doublet of gaugini and a triplet of auxiliary scalar fields. The couplings of these $n + 1$ vector multiplets to the Weyl multiplet are encoded in a holomorphic function $F(X^I, \hat{A})$, which is homogenous of degree two and thus satisfies $X^I F_I + 2\hat{A}F_{\hat{A}} = 2F$, where $F_I = \partial F / \partial X^I$, $F_{\hat{A}} = \partial F / \partial \hat{A}$.

The field equations of the vector multiplets are subject to equivalence transformations corresponding to electric-magnetic duality, which do not involve the fields of the Weyl multiplet. These equivalence transformations constitute $SP(2n + 2; \mathbf{Z})$ transformations. Two complex $(2n + 2)$ -component vectors can now be defined which transform linearly under $SP(2n + 2; \mathbf{Z})$ transformations, namely

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} X^I \\ F_J(X, \hat{A}) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} F_{\mu\nu}^{\pm I} \\ G_{\mu\nu J}^{\pm} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

where $(F_{\mu\nu}^{\pm I}, G_{\mu\nu J}^{\pm})$ denotes the (anti-)selfdual part of $(F_{\mu\nu}^I, G_{\mu\nu J})$. The field strength $G_{\mu\nu J}^{\pm}$ is defined by the variation of the action with respect to $F_{\mu\nu}^{\pm J}$. By integrating the gauge fields over two-dimensional surfaces enclosing their sources, it is possible to as-

sociate to $(F_{\mu\nu}^{+I}, G_{\mu\nu J}^+)$ a symplectic vector (p^I, q_J) comprising the magnetic and electric charges. It is then possible to construct a complex quantity Z out of the charges and of V which is invariant under symplectic transformations, as follows,

$$Z = e^{\mathcal{K}/2} (p^I F_I(X, \hat{A}) - q_I X^I), \quad (18)$$

where $e^{-\mathcal{K}} = i[\bar{X}^I F_I(X, \hat{A}) - \bar{F}_I(\bar{X}, \hat{A}) X^I]$.

The associated (Wilsonian) effective Lagrangian describing the coupling of these vector multiplets to supergravity is complicated. We only display those terms which will be relevant for the computation of the entropy of a static supersymmetric black hole,

$$8\pi\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2}e^{-\mathcal{K}}R + \frac{1}{2}(iF_{\hat{A}}\hat{C} + \text{h.c.}) + \dots, \quad (19)$$

where $\hat{C} = 64 C^{-\mu\nu\rho\sigma} C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^- + 16 \varepsilon_{ij} T^{\mu\nu ij} f_{\mu}{}^{\rho} T_{\rho\nu kl} \varepsilon^{kl} + \dots$. Here $C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^-$ denotes the anti-selfdual part of the Weyl tensor $C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$, and $f_{\mu}{}^{\nu} = \frac{1}{2}R_{\mu}{}^{\nu} - \frac{1}{12}R\delta_{\mu}{}^{\nu} + \dots$. Eventually we set $e^{-\mathcal{K}} = 1$ in order to obtain a properly normalized Einstein-Hilbert term. We note that the Lagrangian contains $C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2$ -terms, but no terms involving derivatives of the Riemann curvature tensor. By expanding the holomorphic function $F(X, \hat{A})$ in powers of $\hat{A}$, $F(X, \hat{A}) = \sum_{g=0}^{\infty} F^{(g)}(X) \hat{A}^g$, we see that the Lagrangian (19) contains an infinite set of curvature terms of the type $C^2(T^{\mu\nu ij} \varepsilon^{ij})^{2g-2}$ (where $g \geq 1$) with scalar field-dependent coupling functions $F^{(g)}(X)$.

As alluded to above, the static, supersymmetric black hole is constructed as a solitonic interpolation between two $N = 2$ supersymmetric groundstates. The near-horizon solution can be specified by imposing full $N = 2$ supersymmetry on the bosonic quantities. A careful analysis [1] of the resulting restrictions on the bosonic background shows that the X^I and $\hat{A}$ must be constant at the horizon. The near-horizon space-time geometry is determined to be of the Bertotti-Robinson type, with $T^{01 ij} = -iT^{23 ij} =$

$2\varepsilon^{ij}\exp[-\mathcal{K}/2]\bar{Z}^{-1}$, while all other components of T^{abij} vanish. Therefore we have $\hat{A} = -64\exp[-\mathcal{K}]\bar{Z}^{-2}$.

The requirement of $N = 2$ supersymmetry at the horizon does not by itself fix the actual values of the constants X^I . To do so, we have to invoke the so-called fixed-point behaviour [5] for the scalar fields X^I at the horizon, according to which, regardless of their values at spatial infinity, the X^I (or rather, ratios of the X^I) evolve towards the horizon and take values that are determined in terms of the charges carried by the black hole. This fixed-point behaviour has been established in the absence of higher-derivative interactions. Assuming that such a behaviour holds in the presence of these interactions, one can generally argue on the basis of electric/magnetic duality that the symplectic vectors V and (p^I, q_J) must be proportional, which in many cases suffices to explicitly evaluate the X^I in terms of the charges. However, the X^I are defined projectively, so that they are only determined modulo an uniform complex constant. This is one of the reasons why it is convenient to introduce rescaled variables $Y^I = e^{\mathcal{K}/2}\bar{Z}X^I$ and $\Upsilon = e^{\mathcal{K}}\bar{Z}^2\hat{A} = -64$. Using the homogeneity property of F mentioned earlier, it follows that the relation between moduli and charges now reads $Y^I - \bar{Y}^I = ip^I$ and $F_I(Y, \Upsilon) - \bar{F}_I(\bar{Y}, \bar{\Upsilon}) = iq_I$. These equations determine the values of the rescaled fields Y^I in terms of the black hole charges. Furthermore it follows from (18) that $|Z|^2 = p^IF_I(Y, \Upsilon) - q_IY^I$, which determines the value of $|Z|$ in terms of (p^I, q_J) .

The entropy of the static black hole solution described above can now be computed from (16), using (19). The result takes the remarkably concise form

$$\mathcal{S} = \pi \left[|Z|^2 - 256 \operatorname{Im} F_{\hat{A}} \right] . \quad (20)$$

The first term denotes the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy contribution, whereas the second term is due to Wald's modification of the definition of the entropy in the presence of higher-derivative interactions (the actual contribution originates from $R T^2$ -terms). Note that when switching on the higher-derivative interactions, the value of $|Z|$ changes and hence also the horizon area changes. There are thus two ways in which the black hole entropy is modified, namely by a change of the near-horizon geometry and by an explicit deviation from the area law. The entropy (20) is now entirely determined in terms of the charges carried by the black hole.

With these results one can now consider the effective field theory corresponding to type-IIA string theory compactified on a Calabi-Yau threefold, in the limit where the volume of the Calabi-Yau threefold is taken to be large, and compare the result for the black hole entropy with the results of [3] obtained from the counting of micro states for the very same objects in the same limit. The associated homogenous function $F(Y, \Upsilon)$ is given by (with $I = 0, \dots, n$ and $A = 1, \dots, n$)

$$F(Y, \Upsilon) = \frac{D_{ABC} Y^A Y^B Y^C}{Y^0} + d_A \frac{Y^A}{Y^0} \Upsilon, \quad (21)$$

where the constants D_{ABC} and d_A are related to the intersection numbers C_{ABC} of the four-cycles and the second Chern-class number c_{2A} of the Calabi-Yau manifold by $D_{ABC} = -\frac{1}{6} C_{ABC}$ and $d_A = -\frac{1}{24} \frac{1}{64} c_{2A}$. The Lagrangian (19) associated with this homogenous function thus contains a term proportional to $c_{2A} \text{Im } z^A C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2$, where $z^A = Y^A/Y^0$. The Y^I can now be solved for black holes with $p^0 = 0$. Substituting the result into the formula (20) for the macroscopic entropy, one finds [1],

$$\mathcal{S} = 2\pi \sqrt{\frac{1}{6} |\hat{q}_0| (C_{ABC} p^A p^B p^C + c_{2A} p^A)}, \quad (22)$$

where $\hat{q}_0 = q_0 + \frac{1}{12}D^{AB}q_Aq_B$ with $D_{AB} = D_{ABC}p^C$ and $D_{AB}D^{BC} = \delta_A^C$. The expression (22) for the macroscopic entropy is in exact agreement with the microscopic entropy formula computed in [3] via state counting.

References

1. G. L. Cardoso, B. de Wit and T. Mohaupt, *Phys. Lett.* **B451** (1999) 309, [hep-th/9812082](#); *Deviations from the area law for supersymmetric black holes*, [hep-th/9904005](#); *Macroscopic entropy formulae and non-holomorphic corrections for supersymmetric black holes*, [hep-th/9906094](#).
2. A. Strominger and C. Vafa, *Phys. Lett.* **B379** (1996) 99, [hep-th/9601029](#).
3. J. M. Maldacena, A. Strominger and E. Witten, *J. High Energy Phys.* **12** (1997) 2, [hep-th/9711053](#); C. Vafa, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2** (1998) 207, [hep-th/9711067](#).
4. R. M. Wald, *Phys. Rev.* **D48** (1993) 3427, [gr-qc/9307038](#); T. Jacobson, G. Kang and R. C. Myers, *Phys. Rev.* **D49** (1994) 6587, [gr-qc/9312023](#); V. Iyer and R. M. Wald, *Phys. Rev.* **D50** (1994) 846, [gr-qc/9403028](#); T. Jacobson, G. Kang and R. C. Myers, *Black Hole Entropy in Higher Curvature Gravity*, [gr-qc/9502009](#).
5. S. Ferrara, R. Kallosh and A. Strominger, *Phys. Rev.* **D52** (1995) 5412, [hep-th/9508072](#); A. Strominger, *Phys. Lett.* **B383** (1996) 39, [hep-th/9602111](#); S. Ferrara and R. Kallosh, *Phys. Rev.* **D54** (1996) 1514, [hep-th/9602136](#); *Phys. Rev.* **D54** (1996) 1525, [hep-th/9603090](#); G. Moore, *Attractors and Arithmetic*, [hep-th/9807056](#); *Arithmetic and Attractors*, [hep-th/9807087](#).